

No. 9335. 4^a 345

21-40



GIVEN BY

SECRET DOCUMENTS

9333.4 A375
SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES
AND COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE HENSEL AND SENATOR JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN, AND FRANCIS P. CARR

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
PURSUANT TO
S. Res. 189

PART 22

MAY 6, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

Poston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

SEP 8 - 1954

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota	JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine	HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	ALTON A. LENNON, North Carolina

RICHARD J. O'MELIA, *General Counsel*

WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota, *Chairman*

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois	JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas
CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan	HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho	STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

RAY H. JENKINS, *Chief Counsel*

THOMAS R. PREWITT, *Assistant Counsel*

ROBERT A. COLLIER, *Assistant Counsel*

SOLIS HORWITZ, *Assistant Counsel*

CHARLES A. MANER, *Secretary*

CONTENTS

Index-----	Page I
Testimony of—	
Adams, John G., counselor, Department of the Army-----	838
Stevens, Hon. Robert T., Secretary, Department of the Army-----	829

SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES AND
COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE
HENSEL AND SENATOR JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN,
AND FRANCIS P. CARR

THURSDAY, MAY 6, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

AFTER RECESS

(The hearing was resumed at 2:45 p. m., pursuant to recess.)

Present: Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota, chairman; Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican, Illinois; Senator Charles E. Potter, Republican, Michigan; Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Republican, Idaho; Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, Arkansas; Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Washington; and Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, Missouri.

Also present: Ray H. Jenkins, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Thomas R. Prewitt, assistant counsel; and Ruth Y. Watt, chief clerk.

Principal participants: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, a United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin; Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Francis P. Carr, executive director of the subcommittee; Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army; John G. Adams, Counselor to the Army; Joseph N. Welch, special counsel for the Army; James D. St. Clair, special counsel for the Army; and Frederick B. Bryan, counsel to H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has an announcement to make in connection with the monitored telephone calls.

Before doing that, in calling the meeting to order, he wants to start with the customary word of welcome to our guests in the committee room and the customary word of caution that you are here as the guests of the committee under a firm committee rule that there shall be no manifestations of approval or disapproval from the audience at any time. The officers, who have done a splendid job, in the chairman's opinion, in controlling these whole hearings, a wonderful job, continue to have the order from the Chair without further advice to remove from the room politely but firmly anybody violating the conditions under which you entered the room, that you are to refrain from manifestations of approval or disapproval.

Mr. Welch, I hope you will listen closely to the Chair as he endeavors to state the status of things in connection with the monitored telephone calls, because the Chair is not entirely sure that he understands the picture.

We subpoenaed, in conformity with the agreement, all or any monitored telephone calls and transcriptions which might be in the possession of any of the parties on either side of the current controversy. They were subpoenaed some time ago with the instructions that at the time they were assembled and transcribed, the parties in interest in submitting them would make out a certificate subsequently to be sworn to under oath that these were in fact a total presentation of all of the monitored telephone conversations, all of the notebooks, all of the notes which dealt with the current controversy.

Yesterday I told the press after our executive session of yesterday noon that we felt the time had come to finalize the presentation of those monitored conversations with the committee counsel and that we had advised the Army and advised Senator McCarthy's side that by this noon at the latest we wanted those presentations made.

Now, Mr. Welch has advised the Chair that they have run into some delay and some difficulty on the Army's side of this request, which stems from the fact that Mr. Lucas, who does the monitoring, monitors the telephone calls, as the testimony now shows, that come in from wherever they come in with the exception of the White House, members of the Secretary's family or his personal friends, but he monitors them in the order in which they come and they are all in notebooks for the consecutive telephone conversations included where they are.

Mr. Welch advises the committee that, as a consequence, when on occasion there is a security matter discussed which under the Executive order should not be disclosed, it appears in the notebook in the order in which the call happened to be taken on the switchboard rather than in some separate notebook. So he believes that it will be necessary for the Attorney General or somebody from his office to rule on each of the phone calls from the standpoint of security before they are presented.

So we run into the delay involved and we run into the difficulty of making sure that all of the phone calls pertinent to this controversy are received to the satisfaction of all parties concerned as to their totality.

We don't know just what the answer is, but that is the problem we confront. We still want to get the monitored phone calls. We still want to insert them in the record. I think a way must be worked out perhaps whereby a representative of the Attorney General's Office can be present to delete from the phone calls and the notebooks, black them out or something, because our subpoena calls for the notebooks themselves—black them out so that we don't get information which we should not have, and some representation from the McCarthy side of the controversy present to make sure that we get all of the phone calls that are supposed to be included.

That is the difficulty from the Army's side of the case.

Now, Mr. Welch, if I have incorrectly stated that, I wish you would take the floor now on my time and straighten this out. We are simply trying to tell the public and the press where we stand on a problem which has been presented to the Chair over and over again, "When are you going to get the phone calls?"

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, you have presented it with your usual accuracy, sir. I would like to say a word about the position of Army counsel on the thing. I think everyone has understood we want all monitored telephone calls that are material in the case if it is proper to have them in, but we do have the serious security problem both as to Mr. Lucas' notebooks and perhaps as to some of the calls themselves.

I can see no comfortable answer to it except to adopt the suggestion that somebody from the Department of Justice sit in on the sorting and tell us when we have a security matter and then rule it out, if that is what has to be done.

Nobody has approached the Department of Justice on it that I know of, but I think they surely will be of service to the committee, if asked.

Neither Mr. Jenkins nor I have personally had time to read these monitored telephone calls, and I think I am correct in saying no one from Mr. Jenkins' staff has yet read any of them. They have been kept under lock and key both as to such transcripts as there are and as to the original notebooks.

Therefore, I really add nothing to what you said, Mr. Chairman, except that I should think someone on the committee's behalf should approach the Department of Justice—I would much rather it was done by somebody on the committee—and state the problem to them and get their assistance in bringing these things, in sorting them so they can be brought into the courtroom and dealt with as the committee wishes.

Senator MUNDT. Would counsel think this might be a helpful suggestion in removing this particular roadblock toward greater progress in our hearings: If Mr. Jenkins would assign somebody from his staff, and you permit Mr. St. Clair to act for your position, to meet after the hearing this afternoon to see whether we cannot work out with the Department of Justice and any other parties involved a modus operandi whereby we can start tomorrow on this long, laborious job.

Mr. WELCH. It may not be so long. I do not say it is, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Long or short, we have to get the job done and we have to get started.

Mr. WELCH. If no storm blows up so that Mr. St. Clair is very, very badly needed by me or somebody else, I would be happy indeed to have him do that at perhaps 4:30 today.

Senator MUNDT. If not, he or perhaps some other member of the staff could be assigned from your standpoint.

Mr. WELCH. Surely we could assign someone.

Senator MUNDT. Would he meet with whoever is assigned in Mr. Jenkins' office after the hearing this afternoon?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Horwitz has already been given that assignment.

Mr. WELCH. All right.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, one further matter concerning telephone calls. Mr. Hensel was also served with a subpoena in that matter, and Mr. Hensel is prepared to make whatever appropriate certificate under oath or otherwise counsel may suggest to the effect that he has no monitored telephone calls, no transcripts, and that his phone was at no time monitored during any of the periods in question.

Senator MUNDT. Very good. That simplifies that problem very neatly.

Are we ready, then, to begin with the questioning?

Senator POTTER. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Senator Potter.

Senator POTTER. Mr. Chairman this is beginning the third week or the end of the second week of the hearing. I do not know how the other members feel, but I feel as if I, by just sitting through these hearings, have been brainwashed, and I know that certainly the persons who have been more active in this controversy than I must be equally weary.

We know that we have many other important duties to attend to. If I could foresee that this hearing would conclude in the foreseeable future, I wouldn't make the request that I am now about to make. But I can't see any end in sight for many days, weeks, or months.

Therefore, I wish to move at this time, Mr. Chairman, that we, at the conclusion of the hearing this afternoon, recess until Tuesday morning next in order for us to take care of some of our other important business. We have the Taft-Hartley Act amendments being debated on the floor of the Senate. Many of us would like to participate in that debate. Many of us would like to prepare for that participation. I believe that the participants, the committee and the public will greatly benefit by recessing until Tuesday morning. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Senator McClellan.

Senator McCLELLAN. Do I understand the Senator moves to recess tomorrow at noon until Tuesday noon?

Senator POTTER. I move to recess at the conclusion of the hearings tonight until Tuesday morning. That will give us Friday and Monday to work on this vital piece of legislation, and take care of other duties which I know that all Senators have to take care of. I am sure that the participants and the Army would be desirous of that rest.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Senator McClellan.

Senator McCLELLAN. I offer as a substitute motion that we recess tomorrow at noon until Monday morning. I do not need to discuss it.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair hears no second to any motion that has been made.

Senator JACKSON. I second the motion of the substitute.

Senator MUNDT. It has been moved by Senator McClellan and seconded by Senator Jackson in the nature of a substitute—

Senator POTTER. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Senator McCLELLAN. Gladly.

Senator POTTER. Do I understand your substitute to be that we recess from tomorrow noon until Monday morning? In other words, the afternoon session tomorrow will be dispensed with and that is all?

Senator McCLELLAN. Our discussion around the table here, before the session opened, I believe, was that there will be votes tomorrow afternoon.

Senator POTTER. And Monday afternoon and possibly Tuesday afternoon.

Senator McCLELLAN. That may be. But what I had in mind was that this committee should work at all times to expedite these hearings, and we can work until tomorrow at noon, and then we can adjourn over until Monday morning and resume work, and if it is necessary to adjourn for the afternoon of Monday or the afternoon of Tuesday, we may do so.

But I am reluctant to postpone these hearings one minute that is not absolutely necessary.

Senator POTTER. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Senator Potter.

Senator POTTER. I would prefer my original motion, but rather than to have a discussion on it, I will accept the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Senator MUNDT. There has been a motion made and seconded which I am sure is clear to all members of the committee, which adds up to meaning, in substance, that we recess the hearings tomorrow afternoon. Is there any further discussion?

Are you ready for the question?

Those in favor say "Aye".

Contrary "No."

The motion prevails.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT T. STEVENS, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY—Resumed

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Jenkins, I believe this is your time.

Mr. JENKINS. I have no further questions.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has no questions at this time.

Senator McClellan?

Senator McCLELLAN. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Any of the Senators to my right?

Any of the Senators to my left?

We will get to Senator McCarthy in a second.

Mr. Welch, any questions?

Mr. WELCH. No questions.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, as I advised the Chair prior to the recess, there is a matter that I wish to take up that may take some little time. But before I do that, I just wonder if the Chair misstated himself when he suggested that the monitored phone conversations be examined by counsel for Mr. Stevens and Mr. Adams, and counsel for the committee, and I gathered from that that he was excluding anyone from my side of the aisle.

Senator MUNDT. This is a matter, may the Chair say, simply dealing with the security phases, which ones should be eliminated from the standpoint of security by the Attorney General.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would want to know what is being blacked out, what type of security—if Mr. Welch has "Q" clearance, I think maybe my two men have "Q" clearance.

Senator MUNDT. I think the Chair suggested that someone from your committee could be present.

Senator McCARTHY. Okay, just so that is understood.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair, of course, you understand has no authority to give "Q" clearance to either Mr. Welch or to you. That is up to the Attorney General and the Army. But as far as the committee is concerned, we want all parties represented.

Senator McCARTHY. I must admit, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Welch does not have "Q" clearance. The remark was facetious.

Mr. Chairman, just before the noon recess, there was read a letter allegedly from Mr. Brownell, in regard to the 15-page document and the two and a quarter page document which I submitted. I note that Mr. Brownell's letter reveals that the material cannot be submitted in any form. As the Chair will recall, last night I suggested that we delete any security information, anything that would indicate the source of information, informants, et cetera. That has all been deleted from this two and a quarter page document, as far as I can tell. As the Chair knows, this has been authenticated, as to paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 8, which is the entire body of the letter, or document, call it what you may, with the exception of the names, as an accurate résumé of the memorandum from J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. Chairman, I think in view of the importance of this, Mr. Brownell should be called in executive session. I think he should be questioned as to whether or not there is anything in this two and a half page document other than the names which I suggest we delete, of a security nature. As I read it, Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Attorney General will have to agree that this may be embarrassing to some people, embarrassing to those charged with the security of our military, but that it in no way involves security. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that we have a precedent for releasing material. As the Chair knows, Mr. Brownell made a speech in Chicago some time ago. He named not the live spies that we are discussing here, who are still poised with a razor over the jugular vein of this Nation, as I said before. He named a very important dead spy. I don't criticize him for that. I think that was information that the public should have had and should have had long ago. His veracity was questioned, he was criticized for that, he then made public FBI reports, I am authorized to say by Mr. Robert Morris, Mr. Judge Morris, who was the chief counsel of the committee before whom he appeared, that at that time he made available to the committee portions of FBI reports which had never been disclosed before.

Again, I say I don't criticize him for that. He didn't make available the names of any informants and I think it was a job well done. But he has established a precedent. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that as the Chair well knows, I have never, during the entire course of my investigation, I have never disclosed the name of a single informant, and the Chair will note that this document here was prepared very carefully to keep out the names of any informants or the sources of any information. I think the Chair knows also that I never obtained any information from the FBI. But when I received FBI material which is dissiminated and is in the hands of loyalty board members with Communist records, I can no longer respect any classification of that.

In other words, once it is in the conduit, available to Communists, I think maybe that I have no duty to keep this material secret, and I don't intend to.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, at this time, in connection with my request which I am about to make of the Chair, that as far as I personally am concerned, there is no Truman directive or any other directive which is designed not for the security of this Nation, but to prevent embarrassment of those responsible for covering up Communists, no such directive will keep me from making available to the public the type of information which we have here showing gross neglect.

Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come when we should decide as a committee, I address this to my Democrat colleagues as well as my Republican colleagues, whether or not we are to forever continue operating under that Truman blackout order of 1948. I would like to have Mr. Brownell tell us, for example, what progress has been made on reported attempts by the Justice Department—the Chair will recall there were news stories, I believe about a year ago or maybe more, that the Justice Department had been ordered to study the Truman blackout directive with a view to trying to make more information available to the committee.

I would like to question Mr. Brownell as to what progress has been made. I would like to also make it very clear to the American people that I have made a solemn promise to them that I did from coast to coast last year that if they would get rid of my Democrat friends and elect us that we would no longer be honoring these blackout orders. I think this is a good time, Mr. Chairman, to test this order.

I don't think that a congressional committee is bound—if I may have the Chair's attention—I don't think that any congressional committee is bound by the opinion of anyone in the executive as to whether or not they are entitled to certain information. I think the committee, Mr. Chairman, has that matter for themselves. Just in closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to again point out that this letter, while of not great significance in and of itself, is part of a sequence of letters showing that there has been espionage-Russian in our most secret radar laboratories and the sequence of reports, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, will convince anyone who exercises good, common-sense that we have no secrets from the Communists insofar as the A- and H-bomb is concerned. That is a very serious statement to make, Mr. Chairman. If it is true, then we should get to the bottom and find out who is responsible.

I may say that I am getting very, very weary sitting here and acting as though we are playing some little game when this committee's activities may well determine whether this Nation will live or die. We have to clean out those who are responsible, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, those who are responsible, either knowingly or because they were simple dupes covering up Communists and traitors, not dead ones, but live ones.

I ask that the Attorney General be called in executive session so we can question him as to what information can be made available to this committee and what information can be made available to the public, period.

Senator MUNDT. The Senator's question is a little long, but the Chair will endeavor to answer it if he can. I think it has two parts.

The first part is whether or not the Attorney General has ruled on

the admissibility of the two and a quarter page letter, which the Chair must confess he has not read. The Chair will have to say that in his letter of transmittal he enclosed the letter which the Senator refers to and asked specifically the question of the Attorney General whether or not in his opinion it would be injurious to the national security to have it spread in the record, and the reply of the Attorney General was in the affirmative; that he thought it would be injurious.

If the Senator from Wisconsin desires me to write another letter indicating whether certain phases of that two and a quarter or two and three-quarter page letter can be introduced, I will be happy to do that.

In answer to the second part of the question as to whether the Chair believes we should call the Attorney General in and put him under oath and ask him why he decided as he did, the Chair would answer that question in the negative unless he is overruled by his colleagues on the committee.

Senator McCARTHY. This is a most serious matter, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think it should be disposed of on the spur of the moment.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is a great mistake, keeping in mind that a vast number of clerical help in various bureaus have access to the distribution of these letters, I think it is a great mistake for the Senators to say we can't even peek at it. The Senators, if they are to perform their duty, must see the sequence of letters from the FBI in which they point out day after day after day what a dangerous situation we have in our top-secret radar laboratory.

Mr. Chairman, unless we do that, unless the members of this committee can see those reports after there have been deleted the names of informants, it will be impossible for this committee to determine the extent to which we have had gross negligence, putting it mildly, or worse, in various departments of our Government.

Unless, Mr. Chairman, the members of this committee can see those excellent reports submitted by the FBI, it will be impossible for the members of this committee to know why tremendous efforts have been made to call this committee off the investigation, the disclosure of Communists in government.

Mr. Chairman, again I say we are not playing any games here. You would think we were the way we have been bandying things back and forth. We are getting right down, Mr. Chairman, to the point where the blue chips are down, and if we neglect, Mr. Chairman, if we neglect to get to the bottom of the facts because of some Truman order of 1948, then everyone of us sitting at this table should not be in the Senate.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair is in no position to override the ruling of the Attorney General. He has submitted it in writing and has gotten an answer back in writing. We suggest, therefore, that the Senator continue with his interrogatories in conformity with the Attorney General's opinion.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, does the Chair take the position that a committee of the Senate cannot differ with an appointive officer, the Attorney General? Certainly the Chair does not take that position, Mr. Chairman. If the Attorney General has some good reason why these documents should not be made available to the

committee, he should not be bashful about coming down in executive session and telling us why, Mr. Chairman.

He can delete, as he did in the Harry Dexter White, in the case of the dead spies—he can delete the security information and give us the information showing the type of records the FBI did send, and then we can check into this matter and find out who is responsible for ignoring, Mr. Chairman, those reports.

There is no reason on God's earth, Mr. Chairman, why the Attorney General should not be called in executive session and made to answer why parts of these letters—not having to do with security but which might be awfully embarrassing, I will agree, to some people—should not be made available, No. 1, to the members of the committee, and then the next question, whether or not they should not be made available to the public. I think both.

I again ask the Chair not to rule upon this on the spur of the moment. It is too important. I ask him to call an executive session of this committee and to go into that in detail and make a decision. I think the time has come, Mr. Chairman, when we should determine whether or not the Congress has the power to get the necessary information to guard the security of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, we can get information about dishonesty, about corruption, about graft, but it seems we cannot get information about something a thousand times worse; namely, treason. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you call an executive session and that we once and for all decide this question of whether or not we are the lackeys to obey and afraid to overrule a decision made by someone in the executive department.

Senator MUNDT. There is a standing rule that whenever any member of the committee or any of the counsel desire to have an executive session called to discuss the business of the committee, he will call one. I will be glad to call one since you present the request for an executive session.

Senator McCARTHY. I thank the Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Will you proceed with your questioning?

Mr. COHN. Mr. Secretary, over the lunch hour have you had the opportunity to refresh your recollections so you can now tell me whether or not you spoke with me on the telephone concerning the calling of a member of the loyalty board which had cleared Communists?

Secretary STEVENS. No. I remember that you called me at my home occasionally, but I do not remember the substance of the conversations.

Mr. COHN. I would say, sir, I believe that this is the only time I ever called you at your home and the only time I ever spoke with you at your home, and I believe it was Saturday night, October 31. I might ask this, sir: Do you have a monitor on your home telephone as well as your office telephone?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. COHN. Do you have any type of recording machine?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. COHN. I see. To refresh your recollection, Mr. Secretary, I would suggest to you, sir, that on the night of October 31, following a conversation between Mr. Adams and myself, I had a conversation

with you in which you stated it would be personally embarrassing to you if the fact were made known that a member or members of your loyalty board themselves had Communist-front records.

Secretary STEVENS. I absolutely have no recollection of any such conversation.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Secretary, may I now hand to you a news article which appeared, I believe, the night of October 31 concerning the exposure of a member of your loyalty board having a Communist-front record and ask whether or not you did not discuss this article with me over the telephone.

(Document passed to the witness.)

Secretary STEVENS. No, that does not help my memory as far as any telephone conversation is concerned.

Mr. COHN. Sir, maybe I can approach it this way: Do you recall, sir, that there was a time when this committee at the direction of Senator McCarthy asked to have appear before it a member of the Secretary of the Army's screening board which had cleared Communists. You recall that, do you not, sir?

Secretary STEVENS. When was that?

Mr. COHN. The date of his appearance, sir, was October 20, 1953.

Secretary STEVENS. I think I remember that there was such a case that appeared before your committee.

Mr. COHN. And, sir, do you not also recall that this man who was a member of your top loyalty board was himself interrogated concerning Communist-front activities in which he himself had engaged?

Secretary STEVENS. He appeared before your committee, didn't he?

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir; indeed he did.

Secretary STEVENS. I was not there, I believe.

Mr. COHN. I know you were not there, Mr. Stevens, but you discussed this with us and you knew about it; did you not?

You removed him from the loyalty panel after he was called before our committee, did you not, sir?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall that. I will look it up and see.

Senator MCCARTHY. Do you mean, Mr. Secretary, you do not remember whether you removed a man from the loyalty panel after he was called before our committee and after he was exposed to have had Communist connections?

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy, I have a lot of things to do as Secretary of the Army, and I don't know about every move or every rotation that is made off of a loyalty board. I will look it up and see if I can find out the facts. But I do not carry around in my mind, I simply can't—

Senator MCCARTHY. Will you consult Mr. Adams so you can give us that information?

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Adams will testify on all of these points.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Stevens, you told us a dozen times you have all of these people around you so you can get the information you can't remember. I want to know whether or not you removed—

Secretary STEVENS. Why isn't it better to let Mr. Adams testify on the things that he knows about firsthand?

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Secretary, why be so coy? Just turn around and ask him, to refresh your recollection. You had to sign the order.

Secretary STEVENS. I think Mr. Adams should be around to testify on the things that he knows about firsthand, and that is not a fair or proper procedure for me to continually have to be testifying on things that Mr. Adams knows and is supposed to have told me.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, may I just make a suggestion that I think will be helpful to you in answering that question. The question appears to be very simple, and it is whether or not you know that a member of your security loyalty board was removed from the board after he had been questioned in a session of the McCarthy investigating committee.

Now, do you know of your own knowledge or from what Mr. Adams told you or any other person told you, whether or not such a thing occurred?

Secretary STEVENS. I know, Mr. Jenkins, that there are changes in those boards repeatedly. As to whether or not there was a change made immediately after a man appeared before Senator McCarthy's committee, I honestly don't know.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, that is an answer, perhaps a partial answer.

Mr. Secretary, it is probably not a full answer. Have I stated the question correctly?

Mr. COHN. Yes, of course, Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Secretary, there is no disposition on my part to prod any one. We are trying to get along. The question is this, I will repeat it: Do you either know of your own knowledge or do you have information from Mr. Adams or any one under your direction or command, whether or not a member of your loyalty security board was removed therefrom after he had been questioned by the McCarthy investigating committee?

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir; I don't. I cannot remember whether or not he had been removed right after being questioned by this committee. I cannot remember.

Mr. JENKINS. That is an answer, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. It is a direct answer.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Stevens, is it true that you appoint the members of that board?

Secretary STEVENS. There are recommendations made to me and I think it is my authority—isn't it?—it is appointed in my name.

Senator McCARTHY. And they are removed in your name?

Secretary STEVENS. That is right.

Senator McCARTHY. I just asked you, in view of the fact that you cannot remember whether or not you removed this man, after he was before our committee, in view of the fact that you were the man who had to take the action, I merely asked you to refresh your recollection by turning again to Mr. Adams, as you did just now, and have him refresh your recollection. I am not talking about anything after—

Secretary STEVENS. Senator McCarthy, there are many, many—

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Secretary, let me finish. I am not talking about any action on Mr. Adams' part. I am talking about action on your part that you and you alone can testify to.

Now, you say you don't remember. I ask you now, sir, if you won't refresh your recollection by turning to one of the bevy of aides that you have around you, and after doing that, if you still can't tell us, well and good.

Secretary STEVENS. I think Mr. Adams should testify on it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Secretary, there is no objection on the part of anyone, I am sure not on the part of the committee, to you now turning to Mr. Adams and having him refresh your recollection on that point of inquiry.

Secretary STEVENS. I would like to make it clear before I do, that there are thousands of actions taken in the name of the Secretary of the Army or the Air Force or the Navy that they know nothing about. It is just utterly inconceivable that a Secretary of a military department could possibly know of all the actions that are taken in his name, and if I don't know about the removal of 1 man from 1 board, it is no unusual thing, let me assure you.

Mr. JENKINS. And there would be no criticism of you, as far as I am concerned. I am merely suggesting that no harm can come now from a 10-minute conference with Mr. Adams to determine whether or not he can refresh your recollection and then we can pass on to something else.

Senator MUNDT. May I make it very clear, Mr. Secretary, on behalf of the subcommittee. We think your statement is a hundred percent correct, that there are a great many actions taken that you can't remember that are taken in your name, and certainly there is no criticism of you turning to your aides that you have brought with you, that we have suggested you properly brought with you, for that purpose, to consult with them. That is in the interest of moving the hearings along. If you need to consult, you simply ask. There is certainly nothing improper in your asking.

Secretary STEVENS. Mr. Adams was brought here to testify, he is to be a witness. A lot of my associates are here because they have special knowledge in certain fields that I may want to refer to, and who are not expected to be witnesses.

Senator MUNDT. You may refer to any aide if he is here.

Mr. Welch?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, there is a difference between refreshing a man's recollection, which is always proper, and simply being told something that he does not recall and be expected to repeat it, parrot-like, to this committee. I don't suppose turning to Mr. Adams and asking him a question will actually refresh his recollection.

Mr. JENKINS. We could have found it out long ago, Mr. Welch, and be on many other subjects by this time. I certainly see no objection to it.

Mr. WELCH. All right.

Mr. JENKINS. We have spent a lot of time discussing it and it could have been determined 10 minutes ago, I would say.

Secretary STEVENS. I just don't—this is a somewhat extensive discussion I am having here. It is not just a yes or no business, and I don't feel I will be able to answer that question for a considerable period of time until I go into it and get the facts and come back here prepared to testify, if that is what you want me to do, or put Mr. Adams on and let him testify.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest a 5-minute recess.

Secretary STEVENS. I am not sure that will be long enough.

Senator MUNDT. The Secretary does not think that will be long enough. May the Chair suggest if that question requires a longer conference even than 5 minutes, that you make your conference with

him during the course of the evening and we will defer the answer to that particular question until tomorrow.

Senator McCARTHY. Maybe I can refresh the Secretary's recollection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman. May I be heard? That is the simplest thing, to call Mr. Adams now, and let him tell what is what. I have no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Welch, there are certain facts that may be proven by more than one witness. Apparently, the Senator has the right to question the Secretary. He is on the witness stand. The fact that Mr. Adams knows about it does not preclude the Secretary being asked about it. Now, may I ask this question: Is there any objection on the part of the McCarthy staff, Senator McCarthy's staff, for the purpose of refreshing the Secretary's recollection, and in order to enable us to get along, to write the name of that person, and not make it public now and pass it to him and let him see that name and let him see whether or not—

Mr. COHN. Not only did we write his name, but I think we furnished Mr. Stevens's counsel with the transcripts.

Mr. JENKINS. Could you write it now and pass it to him and not make it a matter of public record, and if that does not refresh his recollection, I would say that nothing would, and that we ought to pass to another point of inquiry.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Jenkins, I just wanted to make it clear. This is not one of a thousand cases. This is—I am sorry, sir.

(Document handed to witness.)

Senator McCARTHY. After you look at this, Mr. Secretary, can I ask you whether or not you and I didn't discuss this particular case at the Pentagon the day you invited me and my staff over for lunch?

Secretary STEVENS. I don't recall having seen that name discussed that day.

Senator McCARTHY. Do you recall that you called me later—and if you don't recall I wish you would check your monitored calls on this—you phoned me and apologized for the statement Mr. Adams had made to the press in which he said this man had not been discharged after I told the press he had been discharged.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir, I have no recollection of that.

Senator McCARTHY. You have no recollection at all?

Secretary STEVENS. That is correct.

Senator McCARTHY. Now that you have the name of this man, Mr. Stevens, in view of the fact that you are the individual who removed him if he was removed, you are the man who finally acted, could you turn around and talk to Mr. Adams? I assume he could refresh your recollection because Mr. Welch has just stated that Mr. Adams could testify to that.

The reason I am asking you to testify is because it is your act, not Mr. Adams' act. Just turn around and talk to him about it.

Secretary STEVENS. It will take some time. It is a complicated thing, and not just a yes and no answer. If you want to recess for a while and let me talk to Mr. Adams for a while I will be glad to do it.

Mr. JENKINS. May I suggest this now, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. JENKINS. For the purpose of resolving fully and finally and for all time the answer to this one question, I suggest that we do now have the Secretary stand aside and call Mr. Adams for the one specific question and one only, and that is whether or not a member of the loyalty security board was removed from that panel after he had been questioned by the Senator McCarthy Investigating Committee. I suggest that be done.

Senator MUNDT. Without objection, I think that should be followed. Mr. Adams will you take the stand and be sworn, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ADAMS. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN G. ADAMS

Senator MUNDT. You may be seated.

Senator McCarthy, Mr. Adams is here as you know to testify on one point alone.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Adams, on this one point alone, you have seen the name of the gentleman we are discussing, have you not?

Mr. ADAMS. I have.

Mr. COHN. You have seen that on the slip of paper we just handed up to Mr. Stevens?

Mr. ADAMS. I have.

Mr. COHN. Had this man been a member of the loyalty security panel—the loyalty security screening board of the Office of the Secretary of the Army?

Mr. ADAMS. He had been.

Mr. COHN. And, sir, were you present in New York on the 30th day of October 1953 when this member of the loyalty security screening board of the Secretary of the Army gave testimony and answered questions put to him concerning his own Communist-front activities?

Mr. ADAMS. I was present this morning when this man was interrogated. Your question needs further amplification because there is some difference of opinion as to whether or not he was on the loyalty screening board at that time. May I explain it fully?

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir. I would first ask you this: Did he not state on that day that he was then and there a member of the loyalty security screening board, and I have reference to page 1420, I think, of this testimony, which was furnished to you at Mr. Welch's request some 2 days ago so you could be prepared on the subject. Was that not the testimony of that gentleman on that day?

Mr. ADAMS. Are you speaking of testimony from your stenographic transcript in New York on October 30?

Mr. COHN. Yes. I am asking you whether or not this man when he was interrogated by us in New York did not say, "I am still a member of the loyalty security screening board. I have never been notified that I am not. I am still eligible to sit."

Mr. ADAMS. I have no recollection of it. If you have a transcript in which he said that, that is the best evidence; but I repeat, sir, I should like an opportunity to amplify my answer.

Mr. COHN. Certainly, sir. Say anything you think will cast light on it.

Mr. ADAMS. All right. The individual was a member of the Secretary's loyalty screening board. In about February of 1953 he sat on the last panel in which he ever participated. During the summer of 1953, some facts of a minor derogatory nature against the individual came to the attention of the people who manage the operation of the board. At that time they ceased to select the man for participation.

Subsequent to the time that that information came to attention, he never again participated as a member of the board. His name was not removed from the board. A letter was submitted to this committee in response to an inquiry in September over the signature of the Director of Legislative Liaison, Major General Reber, which listed among the members of the board this individual.

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMS. May I finish, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. Surely.

Mr. ADAMS. At that time the letter came to my attention, and consultation between my office and the officials in the Army who handle the loyalty security screening board matters was undertaken. The officials at that time pointed out to me—I first pointed out to them the fact that this man had been submitted as being still a member, and I was assured that the individual was no longer participating. I was further assured that the simplest method of dropping the individual from the loyalty screening board was to wait until the new procedures established a new board, which was due in a very few weeks, and in the meantime not to place the individual on any panels. That was the procedure which was followed.

The loyalty security screening board was abolished in about November of 1953, when a subsequent board with a different name was established, new individuals were on it, and that individual was not one of them.

I repeat sir, subsequent to February of 1953 the individual sat on no loyalty panel.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Cohn, your time has expired. I wonder if in the interest of progress by unanimous consent we could agree to let Mr. Cohn have another 10 minutes to conclude his inquiry. Is there objection?

Mr. COHN. If anybody else has any questions, sir, I would be happy to wait.

Senator MUNDT. Counsel?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Adams, then if I understand the situation, this man whose name shall remain anonymous was merely technically a member of the loyalty security board and had not technically been removed therefrom, but had not participated in the hearing or passing upon any cases whatsoever since February 1953; is that correct?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct, sir, and for the reason that information had come to the attention of the proper official indicating that perhaps he should not serve until his own name was cleared or until he was removed.

Mr. JENKINS. I understood you to say initially that there was information of a minor derogatory nature.

Mr. ADAMS. That is my understanding.

Mr. JENKINS. That is all I have to ask Mr. Adams.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has no questions.

Senator McClellan?

Senator McCLELLAN. Just one question. This seems to be directed at Secretary Stevens. This man, I believe, was on the board, was he, at the time Secretary Stevens took office?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir, I think he was. I am not sure, but in February he was—

Senator McCLELLAN. I think we should clear that up.

Mr. ADAMS. He was on the panel for a long time, maybe 18 months or so.

Senator McCLELLAN. February 1953—you say he did not serve any after that?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Senator McCLELLAN. When did Secretary Stevens become Secretary of the Army?

Mr. ADAMS. About the 1st of February 1953.

Senator McCLELLAN. About the 1st of February?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Apparently he did not serve very long after the Secretary came into office; is that correct?

Mr. ADAMS. He did not participate, sir. His name was still on the list.

Senator McCLELLAN. All right, we will call it "participate."

Mr. ADAMS. You are correct, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Can you look up your records and ascertain in what meetings he did participate after Secretary Stevens became Secretary of the Army?

Mr. ADAMS. That can be done, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Will you supply that information?

Mr. ADAMS. I will be glad to, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dirksen?

Senator DIRKSEN. One question, Mr. Adams: Do the members of the loyalty board enjoy a GSA rating? Are they classified?

Mr. ADAMS. The loyalty security screening board consists of civil servants and officers of the Army, and the board is rather large. It is about 20 or 25 people. Groups are selected who are known as panels, to sit on the separate cases. A list of about 20 or 25 people may be selected to be on the loyalty screening board for a period of 2 years, and during that period, one of the individuals from the board may sit on only 3 or 4 panels, and may consider as few as 2 or as many as 10 cases as a participant while the whole board, with the total 25 people, may consider 250 between them.

So this individual, Mr. X, may have participated in 3, 4, or 5 decisions during the time he was on, and it is extra-curricular activity that he did as a civil servant.

Senator DIRKSEN. A member can, however, be dismissed for cause, can he not?

Mr. ADAMS. Dismissed from the Government service?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, entirely, or dismissed from sensitive work for cause.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir; he can be removed from the loyalty board by an arbitrary action of the Secretary, which is done by Secretary as he assigns the responsibility, or just as any other civil servant he can

be discharged for any of the reasons that the civil service has, and an officer of the Army also can be removed from the loyalty board.

Senator JACKSON. Just one question: If he did not serve on—what is it, the screening board?

Mr. COHN. Loyalty security screening board.

Senator JACKSON. After February 1953, what did he do?

Mr. ADAMS. He was a permanent employee.

Senator JACKSON. I do not mean to give away his—

Mr. ADAMS. No, he is a permanent employee on other duties. He is still employed where he was employed. From time to time, maybe every 3 months he was called on the telephone and told "You are on another panel, you are supposed to come and listen to this," so his boss would let him go, and he would go and listen to the case, and reach a decision and then go back to work.

Senator JACKSON. In other words, the panel job was not a full-time job?

Mr. ADAMS. No, sir; just like going around and having the responsibility for collecting the community chest funds for your office.

Senator JACKSON. Is he doing classified work?

Mr. ADAMS. I shouldn't answer you, sir, because I don't know what his assignment is at the moment.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Potter?

Senator POTTER. Mr. Adams, has an investigation been made of the charges against this employee? You stated there was derogatory material of a minor nature. I was wondering if an investigation was made of him.

Mr. ADAMS. Insofar as I know, it was. I do not know what the conclusion was. I should repeat, sir, I am not in the security business, and the matter was in the hands of the Security Division, which has the responsibility. What the ultimate decision in the case of that individual was, I do not know. I have not seen the individual since last October, and there has been no reason for his name to come up until the last couple of weeks. He does not work in the building where I work.

Senator POTTER. Do I understand you to say that he was a civilian employee?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator POTTER. And does your loyalty review of civilian employees differ from that for the military employees?

Mr. ADAMS. There is a difference; yes, sir.

Senator POTTER. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Symington?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Adams, did you say that the last time this man ever served on the Loyalty Board was in February 1953?

Mr. ADAMS. That is what I said, sir. I should say I don't know that from looking at the record myself. I know that from talking to the people who managed the Loyalty Board activities. I did not personally look at the file and see that his last participation was in February 1953. I was told that by the responsible officials.

Senator SYMINGTON. Will you check the record and find out?

Mr. ADAMS. I will, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. You therefore certainly do not know the dates of the last time he participated?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. What date did the Secretary of the Army become Secretary of the Army?

When was he confirmed and went to work?

Mr. ADAMS. I think it was February 4, sir, but I am not sure.

Senator SYMINGTON. Well, I don't like to continue a habit which is apparently to some of my colleagues not too much approved, but would you mind turning and asking Secretary Stevens if he remembers the date that he was—

Mr. ADAMS. February 4, 1953, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dworshak?

Senator DWORSHAK. No questions.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Welch? Or Mr. St. Clair?

Mr. ST. CLAIR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I call your attention, Mr. Adams, to page 1440 of the same document that Mr. Cohn referred you, and ask you if it isn't the case that Mr. X testified under oath that the last panel he sat on was in February or the latest was March of 1953.

Mr. ADAMS. On page 1440 there is a statement from Mr. Cohn:

Mr. COHN. Now, for how long a period of time did you serve in any capacity on the screening board?

Mr. X responded:

From April 1952 until, I think, the last panel I saw on—

I think it means I sat on—

was along in February or March of 1953. I have not sat on a panel since February or March 1953.

That is in the words of Mr. X from the transcript Mr. Cohn just has spoken of.

Mr. ST. CLAIR. When was it, Mr. Adams, that Mr. X testified before the so-called McCarthy committee?

Mr. ADAMS. October 30, 1953.

Mr. ST. CLAIR. Thank you very much.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir.

Mr. Adams, is it not a fact that on the day that Mr. X, as we are calling him here, testified in New York, on October 30, he at that time had full security clearance to handle classified material and was a member of the Loyalty Security Screening Board, technical or however you would have it?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Cohn, you have asked him two questions.

Mr. COHN. I am sorry. I will break it into two parts.

Is it not a fact that Mr. X himself testified that he at the very moment he was testifying had full security clearance?

Mr. ADAMS. I have not read the transcript—I don't think I have ever read the transcript. My recollection is that he did testify that he had security clearance.

Mr. COHN. I might say, sir, Mr. Jenkins, we submitted this transcript 2 days ago.

Mr. JENKINS. You have it now with which to refresh his recollection.

Senator MUNDT. You have it now, and you can refresh his recollection with the transcript.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Adams, I would ask you if you can glance at the copy of the transcript to refresh your recollection and tell us whether or not Mr. X did not state that he had security clearance.

Mr. ADAMS. Will you give us the page, please?

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir; I will. I will suggest you look at page 1420.

Mr. ADAMS. 1420 is the number, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir. One reference is the second question on page 1420. Then I would ask you to follow that up with——

Mr. ADAMS. We weren't furnished the transcript of page 1420, sir. Our transcript begins on page 1428—1438.

Mr. COHN. May I see the copy of that?

Yes. I would like the record to note that the entire transcript was supplied. There is a difference in page numbering between the copy I have and the copy that was made up for Mr. Adams.

Senator MUNDT. Can you bring the page numbering in such shape that you can understand each other when you ask questions?

Mr. COHN. I think we can do that rather promptly.

I have now been furnished with a copy that corresponds exactly with the copy Mr. Adams has, insofar as page numbering. I will return to him the copy we gave him.

(Document handed).

Senator MUNDT. Then, if you will refer to the page number and exact language we should be able to move along quite rapidly.

Mr. ADAMS. While we are waiting, sir, I have just had a note passed up to me that Mr. X sat on four panels, one on May 14, 1952, one on June 17, 1952, one on November 13, 1952, and one on February 19, 1953.

Mr. COHN. February 19 what year?

Mr. ADAMS. 1953.

Mr. COHN. Was Mr. Stevens Secretary of the Army on that day?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. He had been for 15 days.

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir. Now, Mr. Adams, may I direct——

Senator McCARTHY. May I ask one question, Mr. Cohn?

Mr. Adams, we are concerned not merely with Mr. Stevens, but with all of those who have been handling these matters over the past number of years who are still there. Let me ask you this: Do you know whether or not this Mr. X voted in each one of the cases where he was a member of the security panel to clear individuals with Communist——

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, that would not be competent.

Mr. ADAMS. In addition to not being competent——

Mr. JENKINS. That is attempting to bring discredit on Mr. Stevens and it is objected to.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, this is not a trial of Mr. Stevens. I am interested in those in the Pentagon who have been there over the past number of years, who are still there, who are charged with security, and who let a man like Mr. X sit on these panels with the record which he has. Let me finish, please. This is no trial of Mr. Stevens. I think he is one of the principals or characters in this matter. It so happens that he is name the boss over there. But

I am interested in the individuals who have been there and who have been clearing Communists for secret work. If you just restrict us to date Mr. Stevens took over, it is rather a useless investigation.

Mr. JENKINS. The Senator is broadening the scope of inquiry now to perhaps include hundreds and thousands of additional parties in interest.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Stevens is a party in interest and Mr. Adams is, and that those two parties are the only parties in interest now in the Pentagon.

I think the Senator's question is entirely out of order, and I advise the chairman to overrule that question.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair is prepared to rule. Do you want to be heard on a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. That puts me in mind of the time I tried a lawsuit and the judge said "I will now rule for the plaintiff. Would the defendant like to be heard?"

Would you like to hear from me even though you have made up your mind?

Senator MUNDT. I can't say that I covet the opportunity, but if you want to be heard, you have that right.

Senator McCARTHY. Touché.

Mr. Chairman, the contention which I have made over and over the past number of months is that somebody is trying to cover up his improper conduct over in the Pentagon, that they are using a fine, not overly experienced Secretary as their tool. These individuals, who they are I don't know, but they are somebody deathly afraid of being exposed.

In order to show the line of the issuance of the scurrilous reports, we have to go into the background of men like Hensel who was there long before he was, and other individuals.

Mr. Chairman, unless we can show that men who themselves had long Communist records were passing upon the loyalty of other individuals with Communist records, unless we can show who were responsible for this, what position they hold now, we are losing a great opportunity—period.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, the point I am now called to make a ruling upon is perhaps in my mind the easiest one that has been presented so far.

I think it is clear to every member of the committee that Senator McCarthy's question is entirely improper, that Mr. Stevens and Mr. Adams are the only parties in the Pentagon against whom charges have been made, and that this committee surely will not now embrace all of the parties in the Pentagon in which case we will be here until doomsday.

Let me add, Mr. Chairman, that the proof now shows, I think unequivocally, that Mr. X sat on a panel for the last time in February 1953, 15 days after the Secretary came into office. The proof is indisputable that he was technically thereafter, merely technically a member of the board in that he had not been formally notified of his dismissal and that he was never reelected to the panel thereafter and never sat on any case after February 19, 1953, and had not sat on a case between that time and the October 30 hearing.

I think Mr. Adams' knowledge of that matter has been fully exploited and that we should now resume questioning on some other matter.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair sustains the first point of order of counsel, but he cannot sustain the second. Both Senator McCarthy and Mr. Cohn are entitled to 10 minutes to interrogate the witness. They have that right. As long as they interrogate him in order that cannot be denied them under our rules of procedure.

Mr. COHN. I might say with great respect to Mr. Jenkins if he would give me the opportunity to develop the facts I think I can show to his satisfaction that Mr. X, on the day he was called some 8 or 10 months after Mr. Stevens became Secretary, still had full security clearance, still was handling secret information——

Mr. JENKINS. You are entitled to ask that question and I suggest you do so now.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has ruled that you have 10 minutes. I wish you would use them in interrogating the witness, not the Chair.

Mr. COHN. Senator Mundt, I hope you don't feel that I interrogated you.

Senator MUNDT. You have the right to have 10 minutes and you may proceed.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Adams, I now direct your attention to page 1443 and ask you whether or not Mr. X at the very time he appeared before our committee and after Mr. Stevens had been Secretary of the Army for some 10 months, still had full clearance and was working on classified material?

Mr. ADAMS. The answer to both questions is yes, he had full clearance at that time, he was working on classified material.

Mr. COHN. Yes, Mr. Adams. And you talk about some minor information or minor derogatory information.

I will ask you, sir, if you feel that engaging in fund-raising activities for organizations listed by the Attorney General as subversive to the United States—I will ask you, sir, if you feel that knowingly and willfully appointing a man you believed to be a Communist to a post which places him in close association with Government employees, are minor pieces of derogatory information?

Mr. ADAMS. Your question is very long. It is very difficult to answer. I do not remember that those allegations were made against the individual. They may very well have been. I point out to you, sir, however, that allegations of any sort against an individual may not be discussed by employees of the executive branch. No step of any participation or any facts with reference to an individual having to do with his loyalty or security may be discussed.

I point out to you further, sir, that the individual security clearance was taken away from him in November for reexamination, and it was reinstated about December 1. Insofar as I know, the individual still has clearance.

Mr. COHN. Yes, sir. It was taken away after he had been called before our committee, was it not?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Adams, I might say you used the words "minor allegation." I am not talking about allegations, sir, I am talking about admissions. That is why we furnished you this testimony some days

ago, so you could look at it, because this is a matter you and I discussed frequently, that I discussed personally with Mr. Stevens on at least three occasions. This is a matter which goes to the heart of this thing, sir. We think it is one of the most important matters in this proceeding.

Mr. ADAMS. What is your question?

Mr. COHN. My question to you, sir, is this: Do you consider the fact that a man who was a member, technical or otherwise, of a loyalty security screening board, the top board of that kind in the Pentagon, in the Secretary's Office, and a man who had full security clearance and was working on secret material—do you consider the fact that that man had engaged in fund-raising activities for organizations listed by the Attorney General as subversive to this country and that that man had knowingly employed a Communist and put him in close proximity to Government employees, do you consider those two pieces of information minor derogatory information?

Mr. ADAMS. Those two pieces of information are not described by you in the way that they were described to me.

Mr. COHN. My question to you, sir, is do you consider those two pieces of information minor derogatory information, because maybe we have a different definition of what minor derogatory information is about a man passing on the loyalty of Government employees.

Mr. ADAMS. Very respectfully, Mr. Chairman, I know you prefer a yes or no answer. I do not believe this question is susceptible of a yes or no answer. May I make a little more full explanation?

Senator MUNDT. You may, if you are unable to answer it yes or no.

Mr. ADAMS. Loyalty information and security information on individuals is collected and presented to the board which considers the individual. They make their evaluation, and after they make their evaluation there are proper review authorities which make the ultimate decisions. I did not make the evaluation on the individual. I did not make the review of the individual. Those officials who did have determined that the individual is competent to continue in his employment and with the classification and clearance that he has. That is the only answer I can give you, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Proceed.

Mr. COHN. Now, Mr. Adams, may I have an answer to my question, sir. I asked you whether or not you regard those two pieces of concrete information which I put to you as minor derogatory information.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I point out to the Chair again that specific information with reference to the loyalty of any individual is not within my purview to discuss under the Executive order.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Chairman, may I get an answer to that question?

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair inquire whether you are quoting from some sworn testimony and admissions by Mr. X, or are these hypothetical questions?

Mr. COHN. I would have to admit they are a little more than hypothetical. I would say the transcript has been furnished to Mr. Adams so he may refer to it as I did. But Mr. Adams, sir, referred to minor derogatory information. I am now asking Mr. Adams whether he regards those two facts which I have named as instances of minor derogatory information.

Senator MUNDT. In what way are those facts connected with Mr. X?

Mr. COHN. They are connected with Mr. X, because they are Mr. X.

Senator MUNDT. You have sworn testimony that Mr. X was involved in those two practices?

Mr. COHN. There was testimony, sir. It was a staff interrogatory.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, just one question. The fact that somebody may swear something against someone else does not necessarily establish it as a fact. If there has been any adjudication of a fact that this man is Mr. X that is described in the question, then it would be proper to ask the witness.

But just charges or even a sworn statement by someone else that might be denied by the party accused does not of itself establish it as a fact.

Now, this may be that this man has admitted that. If the sworn testimony shows he has admitted it, or any proper tribunal has made a finding those are the facts, then it would be proper.

Senator MUNDT. It was the Chair's understanding that Mr. X had admitted those statements.

Senator McCLELLAN. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

Senator MUNDT. Let us find out for sure. Did Mr. X admit those statements?

Mr. COHN. I would not like to characterize. I think the testimony speaks for itself. We would be glad to furnish the Chair with a transcript as we did furnish Mr. Adams with a transcript some 2 days ago.

Mr. ADAMS. I did not get it.

Mr. JENKINS. For the purpose of the Chair's edification to try to get the question and answer in its proper perspective before the committee, may I try to do that?

Senator MUNDT. You may try, and my good luck goes with you.

Senator JACKSON. May I inquire how many of these cases are we going into?

Senator MUNDT. Just Mr. X, I hope.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Adams, did or not Mr. Cohn refer to you or furnish you a few days ago purported testimony or testimony concerning Mr. X?

Mr. ADAMS. The transcript was furnished to me, to the counsel to Secretary Stevens. I did not read it. If I am derelict in that respect, I apologize to the committee. I have not read it.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you this: State whether or not you know of any evidence that was introduced against Mr. X to the effect that he solicited funds for an organization condemned by the Justice Department.

Mr. ADAMS. I remember Mr. X's testimony in New York. I think the thing that disturbs Mr. Cohn is the fact that I said "minor derogatory"—let me finish, Mr. Jenkins, I am not trying to—

Mr. JENKINS. I understand. You are not trying to evade.

Mr. ADAMS. The thing that disturbs Mr. Cohn is that I said "minor derogatory information." Perhaps I should have said "derogatory information" which in the final analysis was not sufficient in the opinion of the responsible officials to cause the individual's removal. If the word "minor" disturbs the counsel for Senator McCarthy, I withdraw that.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Adams, was there testimony to the effect that Mr. X solicited funds for an organization listed by the Attorney

General's office as being a subversive organization? Was there such testimony, either by Mr. X or any other person, against him?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. X himself was interrogated; the date was October 30; I was present. The transcript was supplied to the Pentagon shortly thereafter. Insofar as I can recall, I have never since read it. I am not competent to answer your question without reading the transcript. For that I do apologize, for not having read it in the last 2 days. I do not remember such testimony.

Mr. JENKINS. You do not remember such testimony?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you remember any testimony that Mr. X employed a Communist or subversive?

Mr. ADAMS. I remember testimony to the effect that Mr. X was one of the officials of the Greenbelt cooperative housing organization out in Northeast Washington about 10 years ago, and that while he was an official, an ex officio mayor or something of that sort, they employed a physician to work for them, and that the physician was brought in to be the doctor for the community, and it developed that the physician had a subversive background. That is my recollection of the transcript. As I state, sir, I have not read it.

Mr. JENKINS. But you have no recollection about whether Mr. X solicited funds for such an organization or not?

Mr. ADAMS. I did not say he didn't. As I said, that happened last October. I have not read the transcript. For that I have apologized twice.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Adams, the question is this, not whether Mr. X is guilty or not, but the question, as I conceive it is this: You stated that there was information concerning Mr. X, information, and that embraces what I have asked you. It does not imply that he is guilty or innocent. But you stated there was information concerning Mr. X. That is hearsay testimony or direct testimony or circumstantial testimony that was of a minor derogatory nature.

Mr. ADAMS. I have qualified the word "minor." That disturbed Mr. Cohn. I now say not of sufficient consequence—

Mr. JENKINS. It might disturb members of the committee, too.

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct. I now say, information that was not of sufficient consequence in the opinion of proper authorities to cause his removal.

Mr. JENKINS. If the information was that he solicited funds for an organization whose aims were inimical to this Government, and that he had had employed a Communist at one time, then you now say that the information concerning him, not whether he is guilty or innocent or not, but the information concerning him was of a derogatory nature, leaving out the word "matter." Is that correct, now?

Mr. ADAMS. The information was of a derogatory nature; that is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. It was of a derogatory nature. Does that answer your question?

Mr. COHN. That relieves me, certainly, on that one point.

Now, sir, having agreed that there was information of a derogatory nature, I will ask you, Mr. Adams—I believe you told us that when this man was called before our committee on October 30, he had a full security clearance. That is correct, is it not, sir?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. And is it a fact that that security clearance was revoked on the instructions of Secretary Stevens after you acquainted him with the testimony of that man before our committee?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. That is correct, is it not, sir?

Mr. ADAMS. That is right.

Mr. COHN. And is it further correct—

Mr. ADAMS. Just one moment, sir. I don't think that the security clearance was revoked because of the individual's testimony before the committee, not for that reason alone.

Mr. COHN. Do you mean there were other reasons as well?

Mr. ADAMS. This was the first time that the facts with reference to this individual had directly been brought either to my attention or to the Secretary's. I do not have a good recollection that I spoke directly to the Secretary about it. I think I spoke to the official who is his superior, and that that official did the revoking of the clearance. Again, such a revocation would have been in the name of the Secretary.

Mr. COHN. Such a revocation would have been in the name of the Secretary?

Mr. ADAMS. That is right.

Mr. COHN. And that revocation—

Senator MUNDT. Would you pull that long, slender mike closer to you? We can't hear some of your answers. Go ahead. Go ahead, Mr. Cohn.

Mr. COHN. And that revocation was made after October 30, as a result of your being present during the interrogation of this man; is that correct?

Mr. ADAMS. That is right.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Adams, did you hear Mr. Carr and me interrogate this man who on October 30 had a full security clearance as to whether or not he had consistently voted to clear Communists working for the Army and working in the Army Signal Corps?

Mr. ADAMS. My recollection of the interrogation of this individual was that on each occasion when inquiries were directed to him about his participation in the Loyalty Board, I interposed an objection to such inquiries. I don't know whether the transcript shows that, but I think that when this individual went to New York, he went separately from me, but I pointed out to you before he was interrogated that we had no objection to any interrogation of the individual with reference to his own background but that we would consistently object to any interrogation of the individual as to any participation he had in any phase of the loyalty program, and that that objection was based upon Army regulations which in turn were based upon pertinent Executive orders then in effect.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Cohn's time has expired.

Does counsel have any questions?

The Chair passes. Senator McClellan?

Senator McCLELLAN. Pass.

Senator MUNDT. Any Senators to my right or left?

Mr. Welch or Mr. St. Clair?

Mr. WELCH. No questions.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Cohn.

Mr. Adams, did you interpose any objection to Mr. X physically appearing before our committee?

Mr. ADAMS. I did not, and the reason I did not is, is that you pointed out to me that your interrogation of the individual was going to go to his personal background.

Mr. COHN. To possible Communist-front activities on his own part; is that right, sir?

Mr. ADAMS. I don't know that you said, quote, "to possible Communist-front activities," but I made it clear that it was interrogation as to his personal background.

Mr. COHN. Will you now agree that I interrogate him about possible Communist-front activities?

Mr. ADAMS. I will agree that you did.

Mr. COHN. Will you agree that he made some admissions in that regard?

Mr. ADAMS. I think the transcript speaks for itself, and as I state to you, sir, I have not read the transcript. It was given to us. For that I apologize. Perhaps I should have. You have the transcript, and you know what he said. I presume that the best way to bring this out would be to read the transcript.

Mr. COHN. If I am given permission of the Chair to do that.

Mr. ADAMS. If you do that—

Senator MUNDT. That might save time.

Mr. ADAMS. I believe you should substitute the name "X" for the name of the individual.

Senator MUNDT. The chair agrees. We don't want to disclose the man's name.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, just so there will be no violation of security I have been going over this and I refer you, Mr. Adams, to page 1454 of the transcript. I wonder if ours are numbered the same?

Mr. ADAMS. 1454 is stamped, and number 17 is typed.

Senator McCARTHY. Will you look at the first part? Will you read to yourself that first paragraph and tell us whether or not he admitted that his home was used for a meeting for a Communist-front organization listed as a Communist front by the Attorney General?

Mr. ADAMS. My recollection of the transcript—

Senator McCARTHY. Just read it.

Mr. ADAMS. I don't think those two sentences are the whole story, Senator McCARTHY. The individual stated that he had permitted somebody who lived in the Greenbelt housing project with him to use his yard as a picnic to get money for the Spanish Loyalists.

Mr. JENKINS. That does not violate any security risks that I can see as far as I know it is all ought to be read and let the committee put its own interpretation upon it.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair agrees that he thinks you should delete the names of the people. Otherwise, you can read it.

Mr. ADAMS. I believe it would be better, Mr. Chairman, if the transcript were read a few lines ahead of where the Senator proposes to start.

Senator MUNDT. Let the witness read it and let Senator McCarthy check the reading. Will the witness avoid the reading of any proper names.

Mr. ADAMS. I think it would be best to start on page 1453 at the middle of the page.

Senator MUNDT. You may start where you desire.

Mr. ADAMS. (Reading):

Mr. COHN. Did you know that Y—

I am substituting a name here—

was a Communist or a Communist sympathizer?

This is the middle of page 1453.

Mr. X answers:

No, sir. In no way, shape, manner, or form did I ever suspect that he had any such leanings whatsoever.

Mr. COHN. When did you last see Mr. Y?

Mr. X replies:

I last saw Mr. Y in June of 1951.

Mr. COHN. Had you known him socially?

Mr. X replies:

Not even as much as I knew Mr. Z.

Mr. COHN. Now, did you yourself ever give a lawn party for the benefit of the Spanish Loyalists?

Mr. X replied:

No, I did not.

This is the sentence Senator McCarthy wants read:

I was living in a farmhouse instead of right in the town of Greenbelt, and I allowed my premises to be used by Mrs. B to hold such a benefit for Spanish refugees. She had been a nurse with the Spanish Loyalists.

Mr. COHN. When was that?

Mr. X replied:

I am afraid I cannot fix the date exactly. I think that it was sometime in 1949 or 1950, I don't know for sure.

Mr. COHN. Did you attend that party?

Mr. X said:

Well, I did not attend as a guest, but I was there since I allowed it to be held on my premises.

Mr. COHN. Under the auspices of what organization?

Mr. X replied:

I did not know it was held under the auspices of any organization and still don't know if it was. She simply said she would like to do something, having been in Spain. She said she would like to do something for the Spanish refugees. As far as I know, it was a personal thing with her.

Senator MCCARTHY. Now could I refer you back to page 1447 so we can identify Mrs. B who used his home?

Mr. ADAMS. Who do you want, B, X, Y, or Z?

Senator MCCARTHY. You referred to a Mrs. B whom he allowed to use his home. I think we should identify Mrs. B. So refer back to page 1447.

Question. Was——

Mr. ADAMS (reading):

Was Dr. B a pretty-well-known Communist sympathizer?

Senator MCCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. X said:

As I state, looking back I think he was. I presume there were some statements earlier as to why he now thinks he was, whereas he did not then.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Adams, would you do this? You will be on the stand here again. Will you do what you did not do the last 2 days? Will you read this and then come back and answer this question: Whether or not the evidence does not show that this Dr. B was a known Communist; that Mr. X knew that he was treating Government employees handling secret work; that when he was asked whether or not he had ever made known to any Government agency that this man was a Communist sympathizer, and he said he did not, that he felt his political beliefs—I am not quoting now—were of no concern. This is the man who was on the Loyalty Board.

Mr. ADAMS. I will be glad to read the transcript, Senator. I think on page 1448 it is. Mr. Cohn asked Mr. X, "Now, Mr. X, did you know at that time he was a Communist?"

Mr. X replied, "I certainly did not."

Senator McCARTHY. I think it is important to know what you consider minor and major.

Mr. ADAMS. As I said, Senator McCarthy, I have withdrawn the word "minor" which seemed to disturb you, and I apologize for saying it.

Senator McCARTHY. I do not think you can withdraw what you think from the record, Mr. Adams. You have characterized the questioning of Mr. X on the loyalty panel deciding who should handle secret materials and who should not—you have characterized the information against him as minor. Let me ask you this hypothetical question: If a man who is on this important loyalty panel—the top panel in the Pentagon, I believe, isn't it?—if he knew that a man was a Communist sympathizer, if he knew he was treating Government employees who were handling secret work, and if he being on the Loyalty Board did not notify the FBI or any other Government agency, would you consider that minor or major?

Mr. WELCH. I object to that, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. On what ground, Mr. Welch?

Mr. WELCH. The hypothetical question seems to me to embody facts that are not proved in evidence.

Senator MUNDT. I thought it was a hypothetical question instead of one based on fact.

Senator McCARTHY. That is what it is. I am trying to get Mr. Adams' idea of what is minor and major insofar as Communists are concerned.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, this seems to me a sample of what is going to happen to us if we pursue the individual cases and seek to try them in this room.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair may have misunderstood the question, Mr. Welch. I do not think it was directed this time to Mr. X, or Y, or B. It was directed to Mr. Adams, in the hypothetical form in an effort to determine what basis he considered a major or minor infraction of security.

Mr. WELCH. Like many other lawyers, when I start to save time, I waste it.

Senator MUNDT. If you can, answer the question, Mr. Adams; you may want it read back.

Mr. ADAMS. I do want it read back.

Senator MUNDT. Will you read back the question, please?

(The reporter read from his notes as requested.)

Mr. ADAMS. The answer to that is if those facts were true, with reference to this individual, I would think it was serious.

Senator McCARTHY. You think he would be unqualified to sit on that loyalty board?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, but I think it is only fair to qualify it by saying, Senator McCARTHY, one, I do not select the people to the Loyalty Board; and, two, I do not clear them for security. I was not the official who was in any way in the chain of command with reference to this individual. He was considered and the facts against him were considered by the responsible board and by the review organizations, and whatever action was taken against him was taken by the officials who have that responsibility assigned to them.

Senator McCARTHY. Your answer is you would consider him unqualified if those facts were true?

Mr. ADAMS. That is right, if those facts are true as stated. I would consider it serious.

Senator McCARTHY. You would consider him unqualified to sit on that loyalty board?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, again I must state, Senator McCarthy, I do not select and I don't know what my decision would be if I were on the Loyalty Board. When you study loyalty matters and when you live with them all the time, you are able, much better than an individual on the outside, to make decisions with reference to them.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Adams, you are the legal adviser to the Secretary who selects the Board. Would you rather not answer that question? It is a very simple question. Would you consider him unqualified or qualified assuming those facts to be true?

Mr. ADAMS. Assuming the facts to be true exactly as you have stated them, I personally would not select the individual to be on the Board.

Senator McCARTHY. Would you consider him to be unqualified?

Mr. ADAMS. I would consider that I wouldn't select him and I would consider him unqualified, if I considered that there was that information of a serious nature.

Senator McCARTHY. And if you added to that, again we have a political question, the fact that he allowed his home to be used for funds raising—

Mr. ADAMS. His yards to be used for a picnic, do you mean?

Senator McCARTHY. Let me finish my question.

It isn't much of a picnic in my book, to be raising money for a Communist cause.

Mr. ADAMS. That is what his testimony, Senator McCarthy, says, that the yard was used for a picnic.

Senator McCARTHY. I am asking you a question. Please be quiet and then you can say what you want to.

Mr. Adams, proceeding with the hypothetical question, assuming that this man allowed his home to be used for a lawn party, quoting the testimony, for the purpose of raising funds for an organization

which had been previously listed as a front for and doing the work for the Communist Party, assume that the person who held the party was known to him to have been a Communist sympathizer, would you say this additional fact would completely disqualify him to sit on the Board?

Mr. ADAMS. I would say it would be serious, it would be another factor to be considered.

Senator McCARTHY. Would you think that would disqualify him?

Mr. ADAMS. It would disqualify him with me, if the facts were exactly as you have stated them.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I would like permission now, to shorten this——

Senator MUNDT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. I have no further questions.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has none. Senator McClellan?

Senator McCLELLAN. Just one question.

Did I understand you to say this Mr. X sometime last October or November had his security clearance removed?

Mr. ADAMS. His security clearance was lifted in about the first week of November.

Senator McCLELLAN. You call it lifted?

Mr. ADAMS. Well, I say "lifted." It was removed.

Senator McCLELLAN. All right, whatever the term is.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. Then when was it restored or let back down?

Mr. ADAMS. In about a month, after reexamination of the individual's background was obtained.

Senator McCLELLAN. After the proper authorities considered the evidence against him, he was restored to security privileges?

Mr. ADAMS. That is my understanding; yes, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. You say your understanding. Are you testifying from knowledge?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes. I will qualify it only to this extent, sir——

Senator McCLELLAN. If you are not qualified to answer the question, I don't want you to. But I do not want this record left clouded. I understood you to say a while ago he was restored. If you don't know, I don't want that testimony, but want you to find out.

Mr. ADAMS. He was restored.

Senator McCLELLAN. All right; when?

Mr. ADAMS. About a month after his security clearance was suspended, he was suspended for about a month, from about the 1st of November to about the 1st of December 1953.

Senator McCLELLAN. Thank you, that is all I wanted.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dirksen?

Senator DIRKSEN. One question, Mr. Adams. What does full security clearance entitle him to see, by way of documents?

Mr. ADAMS. Full security clearance is a rather inaccurate description.

Senator DIRKSEN. It is a term that Mr. Cohn used.

Mr. ADAMS. That is right, and that is the term that is used in the transcript. Any individual who has a security clearance, he is entitled to see documents of that classification. If he has a top secret clearance, or a secret clearance, he can see documents of that classification provided he has a need to see them, to do his work. And if

he does not have a need to see them to do his work, the fact that he has the clearance does not entitle him to them. So this individual, with whatever his clearance was, was entitled, within the scope of his work, to see documents of that classification.

Senator DIRKSEN. If he had top secret clearance he could see restricted, classified, confidential and top secret?

Mr. ADAMS. If he had top secret he could see restricted, confidential, secret and top secret when necessary in the pursuit of his work.

Senator DIRKSEN. Do you know whether he had top secret clearance?

Mr. ADAMS. It is my recollection that he had top secret clearance.

Senator DIRKSEN. That is all.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. No questions.

Senator MUNDT. Any Senators to my right?

Senator SYMINGTON. No questions.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Welch or Mr. St. Clair?

Senator McCarthy or Mr. Cohn?

Senator McCARTHY. One request of the Chair, and I think Mr. Cohn has one or two questions. In view of the fact that this was testimony taken before this committee, I wonder if it would not be a good idea if we would either have someone on my staff or someone on the committee staff take out the parts that are pertinent to Mr. X's case, present that to Mr. Welch or Mr. Adams so they can be sure that we have the entire picture, and then have that made a part of the record, deleting the names. I think it is rather important in this one typical case to show the type of individual who was——

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair inquire? I thought the Army had been supplied with a transcript of the entire thing.

Senator McCARTHY. They have been supplied with the transcript, Mr. Chairman, but my thought was was: There is much immaterial matter——

Senator MUNDT. I think that would be a function that your staff might perform, then, to submit to Mr. Welch whatever documentation you want to inquire about at a later session.

Senator McCARTHY. And he will offer that for the record.

Senator MUNDT. If the name is deleted.

Senator McCARTHY. We will have it available for the public record within a day or so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman? I would think if the Senator's staff made a selection and the people on my staff thought that ought to be augmented some, it would be agreeable to augment it?

Senator MUNDT. Entirely so, and you should be presented with a full set of hearings as well as the selections.

Mr. Cohn?

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I am sure the committee reserves the right to check on deletions and to compare the full thing. This is a document of the committee, as I understand it.

Mr. COHN. It is, definitely, Senator.

Senator McCLELLAN. So we would have access to it if the occasion arose.

Senator MUNDT. No question about that.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, another point of order. I am sure the Chair agrees that anything that will be deleted from the monitored conversations by the individual, unilateral or cooperative attitudes of the various counsels will be submitted to the committee prior to its deletion.

Senator MUNDT. Unless they involve security matters, I might say. That has to be ruled upon by the Attorney General.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I protest that. I think if they are so high in security that they cannot be shown to the committee, I do not see how they can be shown to the committee counsel or other counsel. I think anything that is deleted by the agreement of counsel between the Army and this committee, and Senator McCarthy and his staff, should be deleted only with the approval of this committee.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, all I had in mind was——

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair inquire first of Senator Symington he raises a very pertinent point, but the Chair must confess he does not know how we are going to solve this jigsaw puzzle, exactly, unless we give to the Attorney General the right to determine the security clearance. I am not sure—you have been in the Secretary's Office, but I am not sure whether I could determine what was security or not.

Senator SYMINGTON. May I raise another point of order?

In my opinion, if the Attorney General of the United States is interrogated with respect to the matters brought out this afternoon, he should be interrogated in an open hearing and not in an executive hearing.

Senator McCARTHY. I would agree with that.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair did not understand the Senator from Missouri to say that on these monitored calls we interrogate the Attorney General?

Senator SYMINGTON. I said I would like to make another point of order at the end of the day. One had to do with the monitored telephone conversations and the other had to do with the discussion with respect to Mr. Brownell.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Cohn has given the Chair some happy information. I think he said he had one or two more questions of Mr. Adams. If that is possible, I think he should get started.

Senator McClellan.

Senator McCLELLAN. You have a point of order or a suggestion before you with reference to Mr. Brownell's testimony. My understanding was that the executive meeting was not to take testimony but was simply to be in the nature of a conference to ascertain how to proceed with respect to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Senator MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Senator McCLELLAN. I never consented to what I regard as important testimony in executive hearing.

Senator MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct, but if we do decide in executive hearing to talk to Mr. Brownell, it was brought up this afternoon that that talking would be done in executive hearing. Therefore, I thank my colleague from Arkansas. The point I want to make is if the decision is to bring up these matters with the Attorney General, that it be done in open hearing after the decision is made and not in executive hearing.

Senator MUNDT. I am sure all those things can be worked out, Senator, in our executive session when we determine whether to ask the Attorney General to come to testify. Now, Mr. Cohn, I do hope that these interruptions have not changed your plan to be able to conclude with Mr. Adams with a few more questions.

Senator McCARTHY. One more interruption, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Symington raised a well-taken point. We were talking about deletions with regard to Mr. X. I want to make it clear that as far as I know there is no security information of any kind or nature in this particular matter. I was merely referring to deletions of the names, which follows the committee procedure not to make public names discussed in executive session.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has understood that. Mr. Cohn.

Mr. COHN. Very well. Mr. Adams, has Mr. X been restored to the Loyalty Security Screening Board?

Mr. ADAMS. No.

Mr. COHN. He is no longer on that Board?

Mr. ADAMS. He is not.

Mr. COHN. Is that right, sir?

Mr. ADAMS. That is right.

Mr. COHN. Now I have no further questions of Mr. Adams.

Senator MUNDT. Has anybody else any questions for Mr. Adams? If not, the Chair is about to dismiss him and unswear him once again. You are dismissed and unsworn, Mr. Adams.

It is 4:25, almost 4:30. What is the pleasure of the committee? We will recess until tomorrow morning at 10:30.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p. m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a. m. the following day, Friday, May 7, 1954.)

INDEX

	Page
Adams, John G.....	829, 833-837
Testimony of.....	838-857
Air Force (United States).....	836
Army (United States).....	826, 828, 830, 834, 836, 840, 849, 855, 856
Army regulations.....	849
Army Signal Corps.....	849
Army's screening board.....	833-835, 840-842
Attorney General.....	826, 829-833, 845-848, 850, 856, 857
Brownell, Herbert.....	830, 831, 856
Brownell letter.....	830
Carr, Francis P.....	849
Chicago speech (Brownell).....	830
Cohn, Roy M.....	851, 852, 856
Communist Party.....	854
Communist sympathizer.....	851
Communists.....	830, 831, 833, 834, 843-845, 848, 850-852, 854
Congress of the United States.....	833
Democrat colleagues.....	831
Department of the Army.....	826, 828, 830, 834, 836, 840, 849, 855, 856
Department of Justice.....	827, 831
Espionage—Russian.....	831
Executive orders.....	846, 849
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).....	830, 832, 833, 852
Federal Government.....	832, 840, 846, 848, 852
Government agency.....	852
Government employees.....	846, 852
Government of the United States.....	832, 840, 846, 848, 852
Greenbelt, Md.....	851
Greenbelt cooperative housing organization.....	848, 850, 851
GSA rating.....	840
H-bomb.....	831
Hensel, H. Struve.....	827, 844
Hoover, J. Edgar.....	830
Horwitz, Mr.....	827
Justice Department.....	827, 831
Legislative Liaison (Director).....	839
Loyalty Security Screening Board.....	833-835, 840-842, 849, 852, 853, 857
Lucas, Mr.....	826, 827
McCarthy, Senator Joe.....	826, 829, 830, 832-835, 837, 838, 844, 845, 850-853, 855-857
McCarthy staff.....	837
Morris, Robert (Judge Morris).....	830
Navy (United States).....	836
New York.....	842, 847, 849
Northeast Washington.....	848
Pentagon.....	837, 844, 846, 848, 852
President of the United States.....	831, 832
"Q" clearance.....	829, 830
Reber, Major General.....	839
Republican colleagues.....	831
St. Clair, James D.....	827
Secretary of the Army.....	826, 829-838, 840, 842-846, 849
Security Division.....	841
Senate of the United States.....	832
Signal Corps (United States Army).....	849
Spain.....	851

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05442 1746

